REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. The amendments introduce no new matter because they are supported by at least Fig. 5, and paragraphs [0038] – [0041] of the specification, as originally filed.

Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 2, rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,654,076 to Ha et al. (hereinafter "Ha"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ha teaches an array substrate for use in a transflective liquid crystal display device that has a high contrast ratio (Abstract). Further, Ha teaches that the array substrate includes a first light-shielding pattern on the substrate which is made of the same material as a gate electrode, also located on the substrate (Abstract and Fig. 5). The Office Action, with reference to Fig. 5, alleges that Ha teaches a feature each of the semiconductor elements adjacent to the element substrate having a light-shielding layer that shields the semiconductor element from incident light. In this regard, the Office Action references elements 125/145 in Fig. 5 of Ha. To any extent that the first light-shielding pattern 125 and the second light-shielding pattern 145 of Ha can be considered to be associated with "each of the semiconductor elements" to shield the semiconductor element from incident light, a conclusion that Applicants do not concede, Ha fails to disclose the light-shielding layer formed substantially over entire reflective display regions of the device and having openings only in substantially the same regions as those of the openings in the reflective plate.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, an electro-optical device, comprising each of the semiconductor elements adjacent to the element substrate having a light-shielding layer disposed on another insulation film, the another insulation film covering the element

substrate, the light-shielding layer shielding the semiconductor element from incident light, the light-shielding layer formed substantially over entire reflective display regions of the device and having openings only in substantially the same regions as those of the openings in the reflective plate.

For at least this reason, Ha cannot be reasonably considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Further, claims 3 and 4 are not anticipated, nor would they have been suggested, by Ha for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly on independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ha are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 3, rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP-A-2001-318377 (hereinafter "JP '377"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

JP '377 teaches a liquid crystal display device intended to improve the use efficiency of light from a back light and to obtain a bright screen with little power consumption when a transmission image is displayed in a liquid crystal display device (Abstract). The Office Action, with reference to at least Fig. 1, indicates that reflection layer 30 formed in the non-transmitting area on the substrate 2 is alleged to correspond to the light-shielding layer recited in claim 1. To any extent that the reflection layer 30 may be considered to correspond to the light-shielding layer recited in the pending claims, a conclusion that Applicants do not concede, the reflection layer 30 disclosed in JP '377 is formed directly on the substrate 2 with no intervening insulation film.

The another insulation film on the element substrate that is the subject matter of the pending claims between the light-shielding layer and the substrate protects the glass substrate

from damage caused by the photolithography process of patterning onto the light-shielding layer during formation and prevents deposits from adhering on the glass substrate. JP '377 teaches no insulation layer, nor is there any mention of the concerns that the insulation layer of the pending claims is intended to overcome.

For at least the above reasons, JP '377 does not teach, nor would it have suggested, a light-shielding layer disposed on another insulation film, the another insulation film formed on the element substrate as is recited, among other features, in independent claim 1. As such, JP '377 cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or even to have suggested, the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Further, claims 3 and 4 are neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by JP '377 for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly on independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP '377 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3 and 4 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Ofiff

Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT

Date: February 1, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, Virginia 22320 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461